

SUMMARIUM

LEADERS: MANAGERS FROM OFFICIALS

A contemplator reflecting upon the development of the European educational systems will esteem the end of the 20-ieth century as an era of significant changes. He will have a good reason to do so: the state public services, inherited from the 19-th century have suffered essential transformations.

The appearance of market-principled competition demonstrates these changes well: “buffer organisations” effectuating aims by “remote-controlling” take over the role of those who order instead of the officials, negotiating with the institutions directly. These “buffer organisations” endeavour to direct public services back to the demands of the tax-payers by competitions and systems of support (quota system, assignments) which match the selection of those who consume or by the combination of the two. The process of the European unification plays more and more significant role in this process which increases the “pool” both of the available sources and of the competing institutions, decreasing automatically the role of the bureaucratic negotiation of the nation state.

The changes produced significant challenges for the leaders of the institutions: they drifted farer and farer from their professional work, which was not already enough in itself to increase the sources. The change in the conditions meant new demands to the leaders: they had to learn organisational and advertising skills, they had to develop efficient functioning in the institutions producing flexible offer of services answering the needs of those who enter the institution and the satisfaction of those who leave it.

Naturally we must not forget that the market conditions and the spirit of competition developed, are artificial and bureaucratically limited. We can see clearly how artificial market regulation is when we have a look at its ideological cradle: as opposed to the overseas model where the know-how of free market trade flows freely into the public sphere (into the public services and directing), the process was launched by political ideologies and changes of party politics in the European countries. The frames of the competition were developed by officials, the sources still came from national and supra-national budgets. Still the institutions found themselves in a multi-dimensional scope where their survival really depended on their own management.

In the former socialist countries the freedom of the basic units of the system grew with the verification of the incapacity of central planing, namely the initiative role of the companies and publicly financed institutions. The increasing activity in the education is well shown by the examples of “experiments” and innovations. The leaders of the institutions could become increasingly determinant in the priorities of the distribution of the

sources as there was no political legitimacy behind the officials of the planning state to support them. The professional reasons for the "developments" gave enough legitimacy to the officials in the budgetary negotiations. By the 80-ies, after the de facto disintegration of the planned economy it was the professional legitimacy of the sub-systems that insured the legitimacy of the system. In Hungary, which is the best example of the disintegrating socialism at this time, the ideology, the "professional autonomy" soon appeared to prove it. The demolishment of planning ran parallel with the policy of financing of the basis, which supported the institutions to the extent of their expenditure of the previous year without determining tasks and priorities. As an influence of basis-financing, the old balance of power survived among the interest groups, which made the management of change impossible inside the institutions.

The staff in the "professionally autonomous" schools had much more freedom than those of the western democracies: practically they themselves could shape their programmes and choose their leaders.

Consequently the scope of the leaders could develop only upwards, towards the political decision-making, towards the priorities of distributing the sources. They could not adjust the operation of their institutions to the aims and the inner relations of power and also the forms of organisations remained as they were. As a consequence of this they are not able to establish channels for the process of the changes: the marketable working force start its own enterprise beside its main job instead of participating in the change of the profile of the institution. This process is a spontaneous privatisation of public services, which goes with the survival of the old, uncompetitive activity and manpower in the institutions. These changes formed one of the most wasteful model of public services before the political changes. The collapse of socialism and the birth of a new, democratic political institutional system found the publicly financed institutions in a twofold situation: on the one hand they inured themselves competitive in the fight for the sources, on the other hand their organisational activity did not match the flexible adaptation to the tasks and their leadership was also weak to have the internal reforms accepted. Officials who grow stronger politically with the development of democracy are less and less willing to listen to the "hungry" institutions when distributing the sources. They started on the road where their Western European colleagues had been a decade before: they would like to turn public services back to the needs of the tax-payers.

By the end of the 90-ies these changes caused a complete renewal of the institutional leadership: they became managers from officials. The present issue of *EDUCATIO* would like to introduce you to these changes.

The foreign studies examine the biggest changes in the higher educational systems. The studies of *Anthony MORGAN* and *Barbara SPORN* show the new developments in the American institutional management. Anthony Morgan, the vice-president responsible for financial and planning matters at the University of Utah introduces us to the development of strategic management. Besides the means of strategic management he demonstrates with examples the main experiences gained in this field by the American universities. Professor Barbara Sporn, researcher of the University of Vienna working in New York describes the change-management of the universities. The study examines the problem of the application of the American experiences in the Central Eastern European countries.

The study of *Magda CZIGANY* gives a less political and more "inner" approach to the new spirit of British institutional management. The study, talking about the experiences of an early (1990) English-Hungarian management project, describes the differences of the European and American models. It claims that the English experience can reassure the

leaders of the universities that the professionalism of the management itself does not endanger but helps the autonomy and the original mission of the universities. Because of lack of inner renewal and quick reaction to the changes of the conditions, higher education is becoming defenceless against external, political forces.

The study of *Péter DRAHOS* describes the problems of the institutional leaders after the socialism. Although the loosened political control helped to increase the role of external sources but the lack of structural self-image is an essential obstacle to the further progress.

The study of *Ilona LISKÓ* demonstrates the transformation of the institutional management in the last few years describing the sociological change of the leaders in the Hungarian vocational schools. In the public education in the election of directors by the teachers we witness a growth of professional confidence towards acceptable programmes and leaders. This process contributes to the demission of leaders who are used to closed negotiation and helps the professionally competent institutional leaders who favour open management.

János SETÉNYI seeks new forms of political management within the new, democratic, local political frames recommending portfolio-management, a new means of integration and planning in the offer of education to the decision-makers.

David PALFREYMAN, the Bursar of the University of Oxford examines the influence of the changes in the political conditions on the management of the higher education in Great-Britain in the second half of the 80-ies. In contrast to the American model the higher educational systems are not open to the innovations of the sphere of economy so the changes start from the political direction. The policy of the conservative government of Great-Britain is an exemplary model of the appearance of the new culture of management on the level of politics.

The study of *Péter Tibor NAGY* introduces us to the rise of professionalism in the institutional management in Hungary. The management in the lower level education developed into independent identity along the conflicts in the management operated by professional activity and the elected school boards. In the 20-ietth century the professionalization increased even if the totalitarian state tried to put it under its political influence.

In order to acquire the new management culture it is necessary to initiate the knowledge of directing formed in the economies based on competition into the management of the institutions. *Gábor HALÁSZ* introduces us to the formation of the manager training.

In the *Interview* Column two school directors talk about the possibilities and limits of school management. The *Document* Column acquaints us with the *Maastricht Treaty* concerning education and vocational training. The *Research* Column summarises the latest research results about managers.

(text of Péter Drahos – translated by Zsuzsa Mácsok)

